

## REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claims 1-6, 19-24 and 29 for informalities therein. In particular, the Examiner believes that there is a word missing in certain places in Claims 1 and 19.

In order to clarify these terms in the claims, Applicants are amending Claims 1 and 19 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been overcome, and it is requested that the objection be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 3 and 24 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner alleges a lack of antecedent basis for certain terms in the claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending Claims 2, 3 and 24. It is respectfully submitted that as amended, there is no lack of antecedent basis for the objected to terms. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-3 and 5-6

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-3 and 5-6 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 2001/0006827) in view of Kawasaki et al. (JP 06-088233). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the feature of “a frame having a metal plate which is perpendicular to the substrate.” This feature is supported by, for example, page 25, line 5 - page 26, line 2 of the specification and Figs. 3A-3H of the present application.

Neither Yamazaki nor Kawasaki disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Therefore, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4

The Examiner also rejects Claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. and Kawasaki et al. and further in view of Ing (U.S. 4,023,523). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 1, this claim is also not disclosed by Yamazaki and Kawasaki. Further, Ing also does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of “a frame having a metal plate which is

perpendicular to the substrate.” Therefore, Claim 4 is patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 19-21 and 23-24

The Examiner also rejects Claims 19-21 and 23-24 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Kawasaki et al. and Utsugi et al. (U.S. 6,294,892). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 19 to recite the feature of “a frame having a metal plate which is perpendicular to the substrate.” As explained above, neither Yamazaki nor Kawasaki disclose or suggest this feature. Utsugi also does not disclose or suggest this feature.

Therefore, independent Claim 19 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 19 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 22

The Examiner also rejects Claim 22 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. and Kawasaki et al. and Utsugi et al. and further in view of Ing. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is dependent on Claim 19. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 29

The Examiner also rejects Claim 29 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Kawasaki et al. and Utsugi et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are also adding new dependent Claims 34-37. Claims 34 and 35 recite that the frame is provided between said source holder and said mask. This feature is supported by, for example, Fig. 4A of the present application. Claims 36 and 37 recite that the source holder passes under said frame and said mask. This feature is supported by, for example, page 20, line 14 of the specification of the present application. As these are dependent claims, they are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment or the new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: May 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street - Ste. 2850  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568